

Presenter: Yu Xia xiayuu@umich.edu

Which LLM to Play? Convergence-Aware Online Model **Selection with Time-Increasing Bandits**



UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN Yu Xia*^{1,2}, Fang Kong*¹, Tong Yu³, Liya Guo⁴, Ryan A. Rossi³, Sungchul Kim³, Shuai Li¹ ¹Shanghai Jiao Tong University, ²University of Michigan, ³Adobe Research, ⁴Tsinghua University

Motivation

• Background: There are so many powerful LLMs nowadays! They have different sizes and may have different advantages.

Research Track

- **Question:** How to decide which model to deploy for a given task?
- Challenge: Traditional methods finetune all candidate models before choosing the best one. But finetuning all LLMs is extremely expensive!



• Our Approach: We adopt an online model selection framework with a multi-armed bandits formulation to select the best model with minimal exploration (i.e., finetuning cost).

Figure 1: An illustrative example of online model selection for LLM summarization.

Methodology

• **Time-Increasing Bandits:** The reward of an arm first increases and then converges along with the times it is pulled.



Figure 2: Increasing-then-converging reward trends of an API-based LLM (GPT-3 Davinci) and a local small LLM (GPT2 Medium) over finetuning steps on a text summarization dataset. The reward considers both model performance and finetuning cost.

• Time-Increasing Upper Confidence Bound (TI-UCB) Algorithm: See Appendix A of our paper for theoretical analysis of upper confidence bound and change detection rationale.

Algorithm 1 TI-UCB Input: K, δ , window size ω , threshold γ ; **Output: Initialize:** $\tau'_i \leftarrow 1, n_i \leftarrow 0, \forall i \in [K];$ 1: for t = 1, ..., T do Linear Increase Prediction for i = 1, ..., K do $\bar{\mu}_{i,n_i(t)} = \hat{\mu}_{i,n_i(t)} + 16\sqrt{\frac{2\ln(1/\delta)}{n_i(t)}};$ 3: end for 4: Upper Confidence Bound Pull arm $A_t \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_i \bar{\mu}_{i,n_i(t)}$ 5: Observe reward $X_{A_t,t}$; 6: Update estimation $\hat{\mu}_{i,n_i(t)}$; 7: Update number of pulls $n_{A_t}(t) \leftarrow n_{A_t}(t) + 1$; 8:

• Logarithmic Regret Upper Bound: See Appendix B for proof.

Theorem 1. Assume that $\delta \leq 1/T$, then the expected regret of TI-UCB algorithm is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[R(T)] \leq \sum_{i:n_i(T) \geq n_i^*(T)} c_i \frac{4096 \ln(T)}{\Delta_{\min}^2} + K\left(\frac{2\pi^2}{3} + \omega + 2 + 2L\right) + 2K_{\max}^2$$

9: if
$$n_{A_t}(t) \ge 2\omega$$
 then
10: if $|\hat{\mu}_{w_1,A_t}(t+1) - \hat{\mu}_{w_2,A_t}(t+1)| > \frac{\gamma}{2}$ for arm A_t then
11: $\tau'_{A_t} \leftarrow t$ and $n_{A_t}(t) \leftarrow 1$;
12: end if
13: end if
14: end for
Sliding Window Change Detection

Experiments

 $\widehat{R(T)} = \sum_{i=1}^{K} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n_i^*(T)} \widehat{\mu}_{i,s} - \sum_{i=1}^{n_i(T)} \widehat{\mu}_{i,s} \right]$ 1. Evaluation Metric: Empirical Cumulative Regret

2. Synthetic Model Selection: Synthetic reward functions randomly selected from $F_{\exp} = \{f(t) = c(1 - e^{-at})\}$ and $F_{\text{poly}} = \left\{ f(t) = c \left(1 - b \left(t + b^{1/\rho} \right)^{-\rho} \right) \right\}$ Number of Pulls

3. Classification Model Selection:



5. Ablation on Change Detection Window Size: We vary the sliding window size to test the sensitivity of TI-UCB performances.



Canonical classification models on IMDB review dataset, e.g., LR: logistic regression, NB: naive bayes, NN: neural network.

4. LLM Selection:

LLMs of different sizes and costs on XSum summarization data. Reward: $X_t = \text{ROUGE-}2 - \eta_t$ Finetuning Cost:

 $\eta_t = \eta_{t-1} + m \cdot 1$ [Do Finetuning] with $\eta_0 = 0$



(a) IMDB Bandits: Reward Functions (b) IMDB Bandits: Cumulative Regret



(a) LLM Bandits: Reward Functions (b) LLM Bandits: Cumulative Regret

6. Findings:

1.5

- TI-UCB outperformed all baselines in online model selection with increasing-then-converging performance trends during finetuning.
- By integrating finetuning cost into reward design, TI-UCB can promisingly balances cost and performance for practical deployment of LLMs.
- Customized change detection window sizes can flexibly tackle situations when there are fluctuations in model performance during training.

